	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	09/890,251	HARADA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jason L Savage	1775

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) _Jason L Savage_.   (3)_____.

(2) _Arnold Turk_.   (4)_____.

Date of Interview: _02 December 2003_.

Type: a)☐ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
      c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant   2)☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☒ No.
     If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _1, 21, 23 and 35_.

Identification of prior art discussed: _JP'467_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☒ was reached.   g)☐ was not reached.   h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _Applicant argued that the limitation of spraying did provide improved results compared to the method of the prior art of coating by PVD. The Examiner agreed that the results in the specification showed improved results from the spraying process and would give weight to the spraying limitation in the claim._

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required